In the District Court of the United States For the District of South Carolina BEAUFORT DIVISION

2004 NOV CO

Chamond Henderson, #80165-038,) 2000 NOV 28 P 1: 56
Petitioner	Civil Action No. 9:06-2400-HFF-GCK
vs.) REPORT OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE)
State of South Carolina and Henry,))
Respondents.))
	_)

This matter is before the court on motion of the petitioner filed November 27, 2006, to withdraw his petition for writ of Habeas Corpus. Petitioner states he wishes to pursue and exhaust his state remedies.

Wherefore, it is recommended that the petitioner's motion be granted and this action be dismissed without prejudice.

United States Magistrate Judge

November 28, 2006

Charleston, South Carolina

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
P.O. Box 835
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Thomas v. Am, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).